

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-15, 17, 19 and 20-23 remain in this application. Claims 8, 10 and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 11 and 15 have been amended. Claim 23 has been added. Claims 1, 11, 15, 21, 22 and 23 are independent claims.

A. Request for Continued Examination

An Advisory Action dated November 16, 2004 stated that proposed amendments would not be entered because they raised new issues that would have required further consideration and/or search. Specifically, it was alleged that claim 11 added new limitations which would have required further consideration. In response to the Advisory Action, Applicant respectfully requests continued examination of the claims as amended.

B. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation that in the Office action dated August 12, 2004, claims 8, 10, 18, 21 and 22 were deemed allowable over the prior art. Claims 8, 10 and 18 were merely objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 8, 10 and 18 and has added independent claim 23. Claim 23 is a combination of the features of claim 10, its base claim 1, and the intervening claim 9.

Based upon the indication of allowable subject matter, it is respectfully submitted that added claim 23 is in an allowable condition.

C. Claims Rejected for Lack of Antecedent Basis

Claims 15 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because of a lack of antecedent basis. Specifically, claim 15 was rejected for lack of antecedent basis for the term "said variety of commercial broadcasts."

Applicant has amended claim 15 by deleting the term "said variety of commercial broadcasts."

Applicant respectfully asserts that by amending claim 15, the claim and its dependent claims are in an allowable condition. Reconsideration of claims 15, 17 and 19 is respectfully requested.

D. Relevance of Previously Filed Remarks

In Paragraph 1 of the Office action, it is stated that Applicant's previously filed remarks regarding the patentability of claims 1-15 and 17-22 were considered, but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks that were previously filed apply equally to the new grounds of rejection. For example, the previously filed remarks regarding the amendment to claim 1 in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the teachings of Terasawa et al. ("Terasawa") are equally relevant to patentably distinguishing the amended claim 1 from the teachings Niijima et al. ("Niijima"). Therefore, the remarks of the previously filed amendment are incorporated herein by reference.

Initially, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Terasawa. The Terasawa patent describes forming reduced-size images at a central site using a transmission apparatus, so that the images can be broadcast to households and other locations for access on a promotion channel. In response, claim 1 was amended to describe the method as one in which the reduced-scale presentations in accordance with Applicant's invention are locally originated from full-scale video information for exclusive display on the viewing screen. Similarly, claim 11 was amended to describe the method as including receiving program transmissions at a particular site, identifying program categories for each television station at the particular site, originating the reduced-scale presentations by signal manipulation that is original to the particular site, displaying each presentation on a single screen at the particular site, and enabling a viewer to select a particular

presentation for full-scale viewing, wherein a selection for full-scale viewing is exclusive to the single screen at the particular site.

Applicant respectfully points out that the teachings of Niijima are on point with the teachings of Terasawa. That is, both patents describe performing operations at a transmission site, so that the benefits may be realized at any and all of the households that receive broadcasts from the transmission site. The teachings of Niijima are described on page 2 of the pending application, in the BACKGROUND ART section. At a transmission site that is remote from the households, multi-screen production circuits and MPEG video encoders are used. A number of such screens are multiplexed by a multiplexer so that they may be transmitted via a single transmission channel. The resultant signal is transmitted to an artificial satellite. Each multi-screen received on a reception side from the satellite is displayed as 3x3 pieces of reduced screens in full motion. A viewer can then find and select a desired program from a preview screen formed from the reduced screens.

Applicant respectfully asserts that since Niijima teaches a method and system that is materially different than the invention described in the pending claims, the Niijima patent does not render the claimed invention unpatentable, whether taken alone or in combination with the cited secondary references to Sciammarella et al. ("Sciammarella") and Noguchi et al. ("Noguchi").

E. Patentability of Claims 1 and 15

Claims 1 and 15 were rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Niijima. As previously noted, claim 1 describes the method as including locally originating the reduced-scale presentations from the full-scale video information for exclusive display on the viewing screen. With regard to this feature, the Office action cites Niijima at column 19 and in Figs. 5 and 9. Column 19 states that the processing includes "receiving a plurality of program selection screens from a single transmission channel." The received program selection screens were the ones multiplexed at the transmission site.

When the demultiplexer (24) at the receiving site receives the data that includes the program selection screens, the demultiplexer separates the data into individual program selection screens that are stored in a matrix into a virtual frame memory (49). Accordingly, the virtual frame memory can be considered to be a virtual or imaginary screen on which 6x9 "reduced screens of programs of different broadcasting channels transmitted thereto from the broadcasting station are arranged."

Since the reduced screens of programs are transmitted to the demultiplexer (24) of the Niijima television shown in Figs. 5 and 9, the "program selection screens" or "reduced screens of programs" are not locally originated directly from full-scale video information for each of the commercial broadcasts. Rather, Niijima teaches that the "reduced-scale presentations" are remotely originated from the full-scale video information for each of the commercial broadcasts. Moreover, the remotely originated "reduced-scale presentations" from the full-scale video information are not generated for exclusive display on the viewing screen. Instead, Niijima repeatedly teaches that the remotely originated program selection screens are multiplexed at the transmission site for transmission via a single transmission channel, which does not include the full-scale video information for each of the commercial broadcasts. It is respectfully asserted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Niijima.

Turning to claim 15, the system is described as including a video processor and a viewing screen which are "operatively associated such that said reduced-scale presentations are available exclusively for said viewing screen." The claim also states that the video processor is connected to receive commercial broadcasts and is configured to output the exclusively available reduced-scale presentations of the commercial broadcasts. The reduced-scale presentations are continuously updated video broadcast information. Thus, the reduced-scale presentations are not MPEG presentations as described in Niijima. Equally importantly, the Niijima patent does not describe a video processor connected to receive commercial broadcasts and configured to output reduced-scale presentations of the commercial

broadcasts, where the reduced-scale presentations are exclusively available for an operatively associated viewing screen.

Another difference between the invention described in claims 1 and 15 compared to the teachings of Niijima relates to the feature of the display of the “totality” of commercial broadcasts currently available within a particular program category. In claim 15, it is stated that all of the commercial broadcasts that are identified with one of the program categories are simultaneously displayed. This is not anticipated, taught or suggested by Niijima, either taken alone or in combination with the other two prior art references. Niijima discloses that a viewing screen is used to display a limited number of programs in a cluster or a limited number of clusters. Column 6, lines 33-63 and various figures (e.g., Fig. 5) of Niijima teach that the multi-preview screen is defined by a program selection screen or array of reduced screens, nine in all, arranged in a 3x3 matrix. The patent also teaches that there are “virtual screens” which may be larger.

If the totality of commercial broadcasts currently available within a program category exceeds the fixed number of “reduced-scale presentations” on the screen of Niijima, the prior art patent does not anticipate the invention described in claims 1 and 15. Applicant’s claimed invention does not impose a limitation regarding the number of commercial broadcasts displayed in any one cluster.

It is respectfully asserted that claims 1 and 15 and their dependent claims describe an invention that is patentably distinguishable from the teachings of Niijima and the combination of Niijima with selected teachings of Sciammarella and Noguchi as proposed in the Office action.

F. Patentability of Claim 11

As previously noted, claim 11 describes a method in which a number of operations all occur at a “particular site.” The operations that occur at the particular site include (1) receiving program transmissions via television channels, (2) identifying program categories for each television channel,

(3) originating reduced-scale presentations by signal manipulation that is original to the particular site, (4) displaying each presentation on a single screen, and (5) enabling a viewer to select a particular presentation for full-scale viewing, wherein the selection is exclusive to the single screen at the particular site.

In rejecting claim 11, the Office action cited column 9, lines 13-26 of Niijima for teaching the step of receiving program transmissions at a particular site via television channels. Then, with regard to the step of originating reduced-scale presentations of each currently available program from video signals of the currently available program, lines 26-31 in column 9 are cited. Moreover, Fig. 5 of Niijima is cited. All of these portions of the patent refer to operations at the receiving site. In the Office action, the "originating reduced-scale presentations" by manipulation of the video signals is alleged to be taught by the Niijima operation of decompressing the reduced screens from compressed video signals. However, as noted in the ABSTRACT of Niijima, the reduced screens are originated and compressed at the transmission site and then transmitted via a single transmission channel to the various receiving sites.


Amended claim 11 now states that each program transmission is defined by video signals currently available via a particular associated one of the television channels and that the reduced-scale presentations are originated from the video signals received via the television channels. The video signals that are manipulated are those that enable viewing of the currently available programs. Thus, in accordance with amended claim 11, the different television channels have associated video signals that enable viewing of the currently available programs, and these video signals received via the television channels are manipulated at the receiving site so as to originate the reduced-scale presentations.

Because the decompression as taught by Niijima manipulates video signals from a single channel, the teachings of the prior art patent are materially different than the invention described in amended claim 11. The secondary reference to Sciamarella was cited to show overlapping previews

of channels. Even if the primary reference to Niijima were to be modified to include the teachings of Sciammarella, the resulting method would not render the claimed invention obvious, as described in amended claim 11. Similarly, Noguchi was cited only with regard to providing cluster splitting and merging (dependent claim 14), so that the combination of Niijima, Sciammarella and Noguchi does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 11, as amended.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. In the case that any issues regarding this application can be resolved expeditiously via a telephone conversation, Applicant invite the Examiner to call Terry McHugh at (650) 969-8458.

Respectfully submitted,



Terry McHugh
Reg. No. 33,261

Date: December 9, 2004

Telephone: (650) 969-8458
Facsimile: (650) 969-6216